DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 046 CS 503 332

AUTHOR Roberts, Charles V.; Cannon, Walter
TITLE Teaching Communication in Content Area Courses: Another Functional Use of the Liberal Arts Curriculum.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-26, 1981). Balance Form may be marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College English; *Communication Skills; Competency Based Education; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Program Descriptions; Reading Skills; *Skill Development; Speech Skills; Student Development; Study Skills; Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a unified effort at Central College (Pella, Iowa) to insure that graduates in all content areas achieve competency in the communication skills of reading, writing, and speaking. The discussion focuses on how the program was set up, what its components are, how all the faculty contribute, the positive impact of the learning/tutorial center and the "Writing Anthology" (a publication of "outstanding" writing by students), and the evaluation methods that maintain the program's standards and effectiveness. Appended materials include samples of skills coding sheets, communication skills objectives, a list of content area courses at Central College that integrate the development of communication skills with the subject matter, and the criteria by which content area teachers judge students' oral, written, and reading skills. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED202046

TEACHING COMMUNICATION IN CONTENT AREA COURSES:

ANOTHER FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULUM

Charles V. Roberts (Ph.D., Temple University, 1979) is Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Communication at Central College, Pella, Iowa 50219. Walter Cannon (Ph.D., Marquette University, 1978) is Assistant Professor of English and Project Director "Across the Curriculum" at Central College, Pella, Iowa 50219.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles V. Roberts
Walter Cannon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper presented to the Eastern Communication Association
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, April, 1981

CS 503 332

TEACHING COMMUNICATION IN CONTENT AREA COURSES: ANOTHER FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULUM

Long before the literacy crisis made front page reading, Central College had recognized the problem and had responded in an innovative way. Rather than requiring more English courses, or more speech courses, it was recognized that the responsibility for teaching students to become effective and responsible communicators could be shared among all departments, rather than be signed over to the English or communications departments. The problems that students were having with reading, writing, and speaking the language and thinking in and with it, did not correspond to the "disease model" and could not be cured by a one-time inoculation with Freshman Composition or some all-purpose rhetoric course. By reinforcing good models of communication in all classes we hoped to change students' language habits. The approach was to reassert the simple strength of the liberal arts tradition. Thrown into a crisis, the liberal arts college responded by drawing upon that which has given it permanence and its basic commitment: teaching students to read and write and speak, and to judge good from bad.

Even though it is difficult to analyze the persuasive quality of the various arguments that created such a program, one thing is certain; all the following arguments were made. It was felt that <u>students</u> would be more motivated to develop proficiency in communication skills if those skills were

taught in the context of the academic disciplines. Skill development would then take on a perceived relevance because of the students' professional or vocational goals, a relevance that was not perceived by freshmen in the traditional required composition course. Professors, too, would be motivated to undertake this project for a variety of reasons. First, since they would have the long-range well-being of their students in mind, they would realize that communication training would be beneficial for them. Second, professors would realize that teaching their subject matter is, in large measure, teaching communication skills; that is, students learn a subject matter by learning to manipulate the symbols of that matter. It would follow then, that instruction in the manipulation of language would aid students in learning any subject. Finally, and by no means least importantly, the plan allowed for a more complete utilization of the faculty, thus helping to sustain enrollments in those disciplines currently out of favor with students. Communication skills cannot be taught in large sections, class size is reduced, and the overflow goes to where there is room. Deans, like Dame Nature, abhor a vacuum, especially in classrooms.

The Program

Central's faculty overwhelmingly embraced a united approach to improve the quality of students' communication skills, regardless of the relative level of those skills.

Power was delegated, plans were made, the initial growth period was financed, and the energized faculty created a combination of curricular and co-curricular components which evolved through the years, nurtured by grants, the benevolent hand of the administration, and the continued enthusiasm of a concerned faculty. Today the skills program has, as its nucleus, a series of skills courses across the curriculum, departmental skills endorsement policies, faculty workshops, an in-house consulting service, and an honors writing anthology, all coordinated with a co-curricular program consisting of a comprehensive skills center and a coding system for monitoring students' skills development.*

Incoming students may sense the skills program even before they have completed registration. Writing samples are taken from each student and holistically scored. The analysis of this writing sample is combined with test scores from various standardized tests (ACT or SAT, Nelson-Denny, etc.) and past academic records. The results constitute a preliminary "skills coding" for each student in each of four areas: reading, writing, speaking/listening, and study skills. These "codes" are sent to advisors who use them to counsel students into appropriate "skills courses." These nearly ubiquitous courses (about a quarter of all courses are designated as skills courses) are aimed at both teaching subject matter and developing communication skills at all levels. The faculty teaching many of these courses have themselves

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

*See samples attached

been educated in the theory and practice of communication skills during summer workshops. Over two-thirds of the faculty have been involved in these month-long sessions where they learn to create and evaluate assignments that incorporate writing, speaking, and reading. The assignments are tested in the classroom and then critiqued by other workshop participants in follow-up sessions held throughout the academic year.

At the end of each term, each professor is asked to evaluate the communication abilities of each of his students. The percentage of faculty returning these evaluations is high (87%) regardless of whether the professor has been involved with the summer workshop program. These evaluations are used to update the original student codings and the information is again sent to the students and their advisors in order to provide better academic counselling.

The system is constructed to give constant help and information to students and advisors throughout the course of the year, not just during the advising cycle. In addition to the in-class instruction, students may avail themselves of the Skills Center, a walk-in, "no hassle" tutoring center. There students can receive help in every academic discipline and in all skills areas. This service is used by 65% of the freshman class and over 40% of the total college population. Some students come on their own initiative while others are referred to the center by concerned faculty (over half come voluntarily). One of the

most important indices for faculty concern over skill development is the departmental endorsement policy. Rather than imposing an institution-wide standard, which would have the effect of taking away the responsibility that every department was committed to sharing, each department determines the communication demands that its graduates face, describes the kind of linguistic maturity that its graduates must have, and then designs a program to ensure students' development. All students, then, must demonstrate to their major department, that they are competent in reading, writing, and speaking (and in some departments, mathematical manipulation) in order to be certified for graduation.

In order to motivate and reward those students who are proficient communicators, Central College supports at least one honors program that directs itself specifically toward skills--The Writing Anthology. This anthology, which publishes about a dozen outstanding student essays each year, provides models of good writing that are useful to teachers and students alike. A unique feature of the anthology is that the assignments that generated the essays are included so that the full pedagogical potential of the publication is exploited. Furthermore, the anthology reinforces the institutional commitment to the full development of students' communication skills, not just their minimal competence.

A cadre of faculty and students work to coordinate the skills program. Watching over and guiding the total program is the "Skills Council." Recently given the status of a

regular standing faculty committee, this body consists of faculty representatives from each division, the Coordinator of the Skills Center, and several student representatives. Their specific tasks include monitoring the content and thrust of the skills courses, staffing and coordinating the summer skills workshops and subsequent follow-up sessions, administering the process of selecting essays for The Writing Anthology, and designing and carrying through an on-going evaluation system for the total skills program. In order to provide additional assistance to the neophyte skills instructor, resource persons in writing, oral communications, and reading, serve as in-house consultants. Given released time, these consultants provide the faculty with a variety of skills-related expertise. They have helped plan and evaluate various writing and speaking assignments, designed computer assisted vocabulary games, and have even provided help with communi-cation skills of individual faculty members.

Permanence and Change

Of course, such a multidimensional program, efficiently coordinated, and responsive to a variety of institutional and social needs, did not spring full blown from any one head. Indeed, it evolved, slowly, and this evolutionary history is instructive for other programs now undergoing the labor of birth.

Perhaps the greatest problem that faced the faculty at the beginning of the program was leadership. While there was consensus that the faculty as a whole be given the responsibility for teaching communication skills, no such unanimity existed about which committee or sub-group should coordinate and monitor the effort. Faculty could teach skills courses simply by designating them as such and promising to teach skills. Since no checks were run and no rigor applied, all could point with pride to the 200 plus courses offered up as "skills courses." Departmental endorsement policies had been drafted and all graduates had ostensibly demonstrated their verbal competence to their respective department, but no one was sure. Certainly, no student had been denied graduation for want of departmental endorsement.

The leadership responsibility was focused somewhat when, a few years, later the faculty created an ad hoc skills council. It had become clear that some system was needed to monitor the skills of the students as they progressed through college. The mission of this committee was limited. Its only sure responsibility was to develop the coding system. The faculty labored, with varying degrees of dedication, insight, and enthusiasm, to develop skills courses, but without much help from sources within or without the college, save the muted applause of their colleagues. All seemed pleased that Central was "working on skills," but none

seemed sure what impact the program was having on the student body.

Compounding the leadership problem was the lack of additional incentive to further refine the program. Wisdom born of hindsight suggests that it is impossible to underestimate the amount of time necessary to implement such a program. Teaching in general is time-intensive and teaching communication skills--especially writing and speaking--is more so. Class size must be reduced or qualified support personnel must be hired to ease the burden. The faculty was not given the time to produce such innovations, nor were they motivated to do so by an administration concerned with costs. Cost effectiveness did not extend to such things as reducing class size, providing released time or stipends for study.

Perhaps these problems could have been resolved without any outside intervention, but fortunately, several grants were written and funded. In 1976, Central received a grant which helped underwrite the improvement of the skills center. In 1979 Central College was awarded an NEH Development Grant that would fund faculty workshops and released time for a director and resource persons in order to refine, coordinate, and evaluate the program. The grant director became the "logical" chairman of the skills council, and the council, in turn, became an executive body responsible for determining and implementing grant-related activities. For example,

applications to participate in the summer workshops were screened and selected by the council. And those workshops became doubly attractive because participants received a stipend and valuable training in the teaching of skills. Thus the NEH Grant became the vehicle for focusing and magnifying the already existing nucleus of leadership.

In order to get a clearer understanding of just what, exactly, the goals of each department were with respect to skills, the council undertook a study of the departmental endorsement policies. As a result of this study, the council helped departments revise their requirements and evaluation techniques. Skills courses too, came under the scrutiny of the council. Process-oriented criteria were used to evaluate existing courses, and a new list of such courses was published and made available to students and academic advisors. Together with the very fortunate choice of a dedicated and single-minded Skills Center Coordinator, the funding by the NEH ensured the coherence and life for the program.

Currently, components of the program are being evaluated and awareness about skills is being heightened. A serious attempt to publicize the program is increasing the status of the participants in the summer workshops and is further motivating faculty members to join in the effort. By the end of the grant-funded period, all departments will have sent representatives, and over two-thirds of the faculty will have participated. An in-house newsletter now publishes

innovations for teaching skills across the curriculum, as well as other news related to skills development on campus. This kind of publicity is proving to be a useful vehicle for galvanizing support for the entire skills effort. Finally, publicizing the effort of the Skills Council is helping to make students aware of the program and serves to enlist their support in the venture.

Some things that happen in the life of a program are delightfully serendipitous, but no less important for that. The Writing Anthology, for example, was an idea that came from a faculty member not usually identified with the skills effort, and indicates the extent to which the collective faculty consciousness has been raised. Furthermore, the publication fills a need because it extends the skills effort in an overt way to all students. While much of the skills apparatus had been aimed at the weaker students, the better ones had been left untouched. The anthology increased the vista of the program and returned some of its idealized breadth.

Finally, the council sought to legitimize its gains by having the ad hoc status transformed into a standing committee of the faculty. This move ensured the continuity of the program by integrating the council into the regular committee structure of the institution.

Evaluation

One aspect of the program that has been of special value in the evolutionary journey recapitulated above is that of

evaluation. Plans for a systematic, objective examination of the state of the program were built into the program at its inception. This evaluative process has increased in scope and sophistication as has the program itself. Besides the obvious grant-related need for evaluation, the program directors have long felt that such rigorous monitoring was warranted for several reasons. Participants in the program need reliable feedback as to the effectiveness of their efforts. Positive results allow for much needed "psychic stroking," while negative findings provide for timely changes in programs. Periodic evaluations serve to involve all three major groups (students, faculty and administrators) in an obtrusive way in the running of the program. This involvement helps to pull together the diverse aspects of the program and give additional visibility to the program itself. Being the "squeakiest wheel on campus" has helped to establish a common image of the purpose of the program. Further, the evaluation process has generated a "bandwagon effect" among both faculty and students. It is now the accepted course of action to be concerned about skills and to work on improving them.

The documentation of effect has taken many forms. Paper-and-pencil tests, in-depth interviews, and written reports of faculty skill-oriented endeavors have been solicited. In addition, behavioral traces have been gathered in an unobtrusive manner so as to verify the beliefs and opinions of participants.

The College community has foresaken the worship of quick change prompted by a course in freshman composition or communication. Instead it has embraced a concept of gradual and more permanent change over the course of several years. The research designs reflect this longitudinal bias. The most sophisticated effort is a planned four year case study of a random sample of college students. These students are being interviewed at least three times a year. Each written assignment they do is being collected, together with other relevant data. Preliminary analysis of this data has revealed several interesting, but as of yet inconclusive results that suggest that Central's program is having an effect upon the perceptions of the students as they view the communication process. It would be premature to accept this data as conclusive proof of the efficacy of the program. These randomly selected students need to be monitored for the full length of their college career. But the results are encouraging. The interim results are being incorporated into the presentations at the summer workshop, and have served to alter the direction of the program in some slight way already. In addition to this effort, a host of other evaluation devices have been utilized. Each year an outside evaluator is brought on campus to test the hypothesis that the seemingly severely subjective, optimistic findings of the in-house evaluators more closely mirror the hopes of the observers than they do the actual nuances of the observed. The past results of such inquisitions have been the rejection

of most such fears and the reaffirmation of the thrust of the program. The findings of these outside consultants have aided the program director in the realignment of the program and in the setting of future agendas.

Other devices are used to monitor the perceptions of the program participants. A questionnaire created by Donald Ecroyd at Temple University which elicits perceptions of the skills emphases in classes has been administered each term to students taught by those faculty members who have participated in the NEH-funded workshop, as well as to students in speech, reading, and composition classes, and to students enrolled in classes taught by "uninitiated" faculty. The results of this measure indicate that some interesting changes took place during the year following the first summer workshop. There was a statistically significant difference between the amount of skill work done in the "uninitiated" faculty member's class and that done in the NEH-trained faculty member's class. This was especially so in the area of writing, but was noted in the areas of reading and speaking as well. When student perceptions were examined for changes over the course of the year, a marked increase in reported work in the areas of writing and speaking was established. Students reported that 25% of their NEH-trained teachers worked on these skills during the Fall term, but fully one-third of these same Faculty members worked on these skills during the Spring. When these perceptions are compared with those of the Faculty, a slight difference of

opinion can be noted. The Faculty members always thought that they were working at the "one-third level," but it took a year for the students to perceive it. Logs kept by those same teachers tends to substantiate this hypothesis of increased awareness. The logs chronicle innovative attempts at teaching skills being incorporated fairly equally throughout the year. However, both the sophistication of the methods and the degree to which the purpose of the assignments was shared with the student increased over the year.

The perceptions of the Faculty were monitored by another paper-and-pencil device completed before and after the summer workshop. This test, created by colleagues at Beaver College in Pennsylvania, revealed that the summer workshop, while not changing faculty attitudes in any dramatic way, did serve to coalesce and direct the beliefs of the faculty in positive and hoped for directions. Together with the logs and other tracking devices, this evidence seems to indicate that the workshops allowed for the training and motivation of the faculty in ways that were highly supportive of the program.

A recent survey of student and faculty perceptions of the total skills program illustrates the success of the program in becoming visible and in facilitating the realization by all parties of the necessity of working on skills. Fully 74% of the students and 93% of the faculty polled indicated that they had noticed a significant increase in the effort to teach skills across the curriculum. Based

on contacts with other colleges, 62% of the students and 92% of the faculty decided that Central's effort was more intense than most other colleges. All groups felt that the greatest change had been in the area of writing, followed closely by speaking and then reading. This increase mirrors the perceived needs of the students. They felt that their writing skills warranted the most effort, followed by speaking skills and reading skills.

When these same students and faculty were asked if the skills program was rigorous enough, over 28% of the students and 35% of the faculty felt that even more could be done. 92% of the students indicated either a moderate or intense desire to better their communication skills. It seems that students are motivated to work on skills and value the effort sufficiently enough to expend quite a bit of energy to do so.

There is always the danger of relying too heavily on the responses to surveys that seek to assess the attitudes and perceptions of students and not investigating actual changes in student behavior. Have these laudable cognitive stands been translated into behavioral commitment? Archival traces and some rather interesting anecdotal evidence seems to indicate that this effort is being made. Since the start of the "Skills Center" in 1977, the number of student contacts has increased over 25%. Well over 65% of the freshman class utilizes the skills center each year. While an impressive 56% of the students who used the center came voluntarily in 1977, 89% did so last year. From the very first, students

have reported only positive experiences with the skills center. 97% of the students report that their work in the skills lab had a positive effect on their grades. This positive response is due, in part, to the fact that the skills center is no longer seen as a "remedial" center. As one student puts it, "Tutors are more than helpful and friendly. They are friends - not someone above me, helping a dummy - I feel very comfortable." So far this year, over 40% of the entire student body has visited the skills lab at least once. The typical user of the skills lab has used it 4.6 times and some zealots have come over 35 times. The use has been so great that the chairs in the skills center have had to be replaced twice as often as similar chairs in faculty offices and classrooms.

Faculty acceptance has been high as witnessed by the participation in the summer workshops (two-thirds of the faculty) and the growth in the number of returned "skills coding sheets" at the end of each term. In the first year of the program only 33% of the professors returned the forms. This past year 87% did.

Evidence of changes in writing, speaking, reading, and listening levels is being gathered. One year of data collection does not yield enough of a perspective to judge effectiveness. Samples are being saved and plans are being made to rigorously examine this evidence at the end of the four year career of our randomly selected college students.

Generalizations

While the grant may have guaranteed the sophistication and continuation of Central's skills program, it is not a necessary ingredient for the success of other ventures. The motivational power of the grant could be replaced by other inducements. Research and Development money could be used to fund faculty workshops; they need not be month-long affairs such as the ones at Central College. The nucleus necessary to start such a program must certainly be smaller than the two-thirds of the faculty that Central has enlisted. Much of the struggle for direction and power could be circumvented by careful pre-planning. The establishment of a "skills council" with powers such as those described above, and staffed by faculty members of sufficient referrent power to give the committee legitimacy would help to clear the way for the program. The evolutionary struggle of the various informational systems need not be engaged in by others.

That is not to say that Central has solved all its problems. While the apparatus for initiating and monitoring activities related to the skills program are in place, thanks to the NEH funding, 1981 is the final year for the grant, and several problems remain: the skills coding is aimed at discovering weaknesses, not assessing strengths. The skills courses need closer monitoring without usurping the autonomy of departments and divisions. It is likely that these courses will need to be reevaluated in light of a new

curriculum revision that is now in the wind. And a way must be found to limit the enrollments of such courses or to provide support personnel to aid the instructional process.

Even though two-thirds of the faculty have participated in the summer workshops, faculties do change and a way must be found to provide for a continuation of the workshop experience.

The most pressing problem seems to be finding ways to reduce the class size of skills courses or to hire sufficiently trained support personnel, or both. Central is exploring various solutions now, but no one answer has risen to the surface. Outside funding, trading the expertise of qualified adults for tuition, spreading an endowed chair among many faculty members committed to skills development, are some of the ideas being experimented with.

The gains of the past few years are real. The structure of the program is now self-perpetuating and no longer relies on the zeal of committed individuals. The program has been refined to a point where effective and efficient communication among students, teachers, and advisors, is the norm.

Due in part to the support of the administration and the NEH, the nagging of the Skills Council, and the basic desire of the faculty to teach their content area in the most effective method possible, Central's commitment to skill development has never been higher. The theory put forth by

Moffett* and others that "you don't know something really well until you can explain it to someone else" has been accepted as the academic rallying cry of the faculty. We are confident that our program will flourish, regardless of the vicissitudes of outside support. Further, we are certain, as only optimistic zealots can be, that sharing the responsibility for skill enhancement can be embraced as the central concept of education in a variety of academic institutions without a massive infusion of Federal money.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

*Moffett, James. Teaching The Universe of Discourse, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.

SAMPLE SKILLS CODING SHEET

(Please attach a student's preprinted label here.)

CODE EXPLANATION: 0: no information
1: no apparent problem
2: suspected or slight problem
3: serious problem

READING ☐ WRITING ☐ SPEAKING/LISTENING ☐ STUDY SKILLS ☐

Please add a rationale for any "2" or "3" codings you give this student. You may wish to circle one or two preprinted comments below, to indicate this student's chief difficulties, as you perceive them. Handwritten comments are also welcome.

If you give this student all "0" codings, please discard this sheet.

(☐ This student is a non-native speaker/writer.)

READING

R1 Limited vocabulary

R2 Limited literal comprehension (main ideas, supporting details, following directions)

R3 Limited critical comprehension (implications, relationships, nuances)

R4 Inappropriate speed

Other:_____

WRITING

W1 Lacks focus/thesis

W2 Weak organization

W3 Unsupported generalizations

W4 General wordiness

W5 Clumsy sentence structure

W6 Imprecise or inappropriate language

W7 Trite or lifeless language

W8 Inadequate documentation of sources

W9 Grammar, punctuation

W10 Spelling

W11 Careless proofing

W12 Illegible handwriting

Other:_____

SPEAKING/LISTENING

S1 Lacks focus/thesis

S2 Lacks organization

S3 Lacks content

S4 Inappropriate word choice

S5 Reluctant or afraid to speak

S6 Distracting nonverbal communication

S7 Mumbles

S8 Inappropriate pronunciation

S9 Lisp, stutter

L1 Inattention/fake attention

L2 Gives little feedback

L3 Listens only for facts

L4 Easily distracted

L5 Possible hearing problem

Other:_____

STUDY SKILLS

SS1 Lacks self-motivation

SS2 Poor time management

SS3 Absenteeism

SS4 Late or uncompleted assignments

SS5 Inadequate note-taking

SS6 Attempts to get others to do some of his/her work

Other:_____

_____

BALANCE FORM 28-AUG-80

ID 77654 NAME WALTER CANNON ROBERTS

****

GENERAL INFORMATION:

RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT- 18 CRS CREDITS BEYOND FIRST YEAR OR LAST 9.0 CRS CREDITS
NEEDED FOR GRADUATION- 36.0 COURSE CREDITS WITH 72.0 GRADE POINTS.
TODATE YOU HAVE EARNED * 25.5 * COURSE CREDITS AND * 57.77 * GRADE POINTS.
PE ORIENTATION- (O K)
COMMUNICATION SKILLS- (NOT SATISFIED)
OF 3-400 LEVEL COURSE CREDITS COMPLETED- * 3.1 *
OF PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE COURSES COMPLETED- * .0 *
OF MUSIC PARTICIPATION COURSES COMPLETED- * .0 *
CUM GPA FOR MAJOR COURSES MUST BE 2.0. YOUR CURRENT MAJOR GPA IS * 2.000 *
NO MORE THAN 18 CREDITS FROM YOUR MAJOR DEPARTMENT MAY COUNT TOWARDS THE 36.0
YOU NEED FOR GRADUATION. YOU HAVE COMPLETED * 6.0 * CREDITS IN YOUR MAJOR.
SKILLS CODES: READING-3 ; WRITING-3 ; SPEAK/LISTEN-2 ; STUDY-3

****

LIBERAL STUDIES REQUIREMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MET:

BEH SCI.	22	150	EL PRIN+BEHAVIOR	1.0	RELIGION		
CR CULT.					ELECT 1	51	110 DEVELOP YOURSELF 1.0
FINE ART 1		111	PHOTOGRAPHY 2	1.0	ELECT 2	25	112 INTRO HUM COMM 1.0
HUM.	55	209	WOMEN MEN IN AME	1.0	ELECT 3	9	110 ELEMENTS OF GEOG 1.0
NAT SCI.	20	208	ENERGY & MAN	1.0			

YOU HAVE COMPLETED *2.6* LS COURSES AT THE 2-400 LEVEL DURING YOUR JR/SR YEAR.

****

MAJOR- COMMUNIC

25	112	INTRO HUM COMM	1.0	B
25	130	UNDER MASS MEDIA	1.0	B-
25	214	INTRAPERSONAL CO	1.0	C+
25	239	NEWS WRIT EDIT	1.0	D-
25	212	THEORIES OF COMM	1.0	D+
25	318	PERSUASION	1.0	C

SAMPLE OBJECTIVES OF SKILLS

Skills Objectives:

Reading: Students will be able to differentiate fact from opinion, analyze arguments and recognize types of evidence employed, understand author's purpose and grasp implications of and relationships among ideas.

Writing: Students will be able to use Edited American English without distracting or misleading errors; to effectively communicate their knowledge, ideas, and questions to anyone, regardless of specialization; handle and cite secondary sources appropriately.

Speaking: Students will be able to communicate to both specialists and laymen using appropriate language; to give well organized speeches to larger groups, clear discussion of ideas in small groups, and straightforward and attentive individual conversations.

Sample Departmental Endorsement Procedure

Education

Writing skills are evaluated through an entry writing survey which all students must complete, and which is evaluated for both style and mechanics as well as content. (Early stages of program.) Subsequent writing assignments include term papers, journals, position papers, lesson plans, and research papers. Speaking and listening skills are evaluated in introduction to teaching and throughout a student's career. Assignments involve small group discussion, leading large group, teaching of classes, oral presentations, and debates. Reading skills are evaluated for literal, inferential, and elaborative comprehension. All courses in required Elementary Education Blocks (total of nine courses) involve evaluation of class assignments in each skill area. Skills evaluation is a continuous process throughout a student's career; final evaluation is normally made following student's second term, senior year.

CRITERIA FOR ORAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS COURSES

1. The teacher structures experiences in oral communications i.e. formal presentation of material to more than five other students; small group leadership/participation; dyadic (one-to-one) interaction of either a formal or informal nature.

2. The teacher discusses with the class the criteria and qualities he will be evaluating in the assignments.

   EXAMPLES:

   A. The teacher mimeographs the assignments and a list of criteria and discusses them with the class.

   B. The teacher assigns sections in appropriate texts and discusses the section briefly with the class.

3. The teacher grades oral presentations for content, rhetorical style and mechanics.

4. The teacher individualizes instruction as students' needs dictate.

5. Use of outside resources, such as the Skills Center, when appropriate, is suggested.

CRITERIA FOR WRITING SKILLS COURSES

1. The teacher structures experiences in written communications, i.e., research papers, short essays, journals or logs.

2. The teacher discusses with the class the criteria and qualities he will be evaluating in the assignments.

   EXAMPLES:

   A. The teacher mimeographs the assignment and a list of criteria and discusses them with the class.

   B. The teacher assigns sections in appropriate texts (such as James D. Lester, Writing Research Papers) and discusses the sections briefly with his class.

3. The teacher grades papers for content, rhetorical style, and mechanics.

4. The teacher individualizes instruction as students' needs dictate.

   EXAMPLES:

   A. Conferences with students before papers are due to discuss outlines or rough drafts.

   B. Grading papers in the presence of the students to discuss problems and alternatives.

   C. Conferences with students after the paper is graded to prepare for rewriting.

5. Use of outside resources, such as the Skills Center, when appropriate, is suggested.

CRITERIA FOR READING SKILLS COURSES

1. Reading is considered as one of the major methods for gathering information.

2. The teacher discusses with the class the particular reading skills necessary for reading assigned material. Attention is given, where needed to teaching these skills.

3. The teacher measures the readability of the textbook or typical material used in the class and compares with student reading level.

   EXAMPLE:
   The Cloze test is easy to develop and quick to administer. It has been proven effective in determining which students in the class will have difficulty in assigned reading.

   EXAMPLES:
   A. Emphasis on vocabulary development during the course so that students are fluent in reading and speaking the "new" words.

   B. Work on the SQ3R method of study. The steps involve Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review. PRACTICE these.

   C. Helpful exercises could involve recognition of main ideas, conclusions, inferences, generalizations, imagery, etc.

4. The teacher develops activities for improving vocabulary and comprehension.

5. Use of outside resources, such as the Skills Center, when appropriate, is suggested.

CENTRAL COLLEGE

PELLA, IOWA 50219

[Information Sent to Students and Advisors]

Central College is committed to teaching communication skills throughout the curriculum at all instructional levels. Furthermore, each department certifies the communications skills of its majors. Each department, then, takes responsibility to help its major develop their abilities to read critically and respond articulately. Much of this development is accomplished by the normal process of taking four years of course work. To make this process as conscious and efficient as possible, you should know that a number of courses in the curriculum are designated as skills courses, which integrate the development of communication skills with the subject matter of the course. These courses are marked with an "S" in the CPI column of your course schedule. The list of skills courses for the 1980-1981 academic year (attached) is intended to help you make more informed course selections as you plan your schedule. You can find, for example, the specific skills emphasis (R=reading, W=writing, S=speaking) that each skills course features.

See your major advisor for information about skills endorsement. And individual instructors will be glad to give more detailed information about the specific requirements for skills courses.

SKILLS COURSES (FALL, WINTER, SPRING)
1980-1981

ART

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
101	L	R,W	INTRO VISUAL ARTS	MILLS	
290		R,W,S	ART THEORY	MILLS	
321	L	R,W	ANCIENT/MEDIEVAL ART	MILLS	
322	L	R,W	RENAISSANCE/MODERN	MILLS	
325	L	W	HIST MODERN ART	DE JONG, JOLINE	*
490		R,W,S	ART THEORY & CRIT	MILLS	

BIOLOGY

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
100	L	R,W,S	ISSUES IN BIO	DANKS,HUFFMAN,STAFF	*
121	L	R,W,S	FOUND IN BIO	DANKS,HUFFMAN,STAFF	*
121		R,W	LAB BIO	DANKS, HUFFMAN,D	*
121		W	LAB BIO	STAFF	*
122		W	FOUND IN BIO 2	BOWLES	*
123		R,W,S	FOUND IN BIO 3	DANKS,HUFFMAN,D	*
123		R,W	LAB BIO	DANKS,HUFFMAN,D	*
221		W	PRINC OF GENETICS	HUFFMAN,D	*
231		W,S	PRINC OF ECOLOGY	STAFF	*
231		W	LAB BIO	STAFF	*
241		W	PRINC OF PHYSIOL	BOWZER	*
251		W,S	PRINC OF CELL STRUCTURE	HUFFMAN,D	*
330		W	VERTEBRATE NAT HIST	BOWLES	*
380		S	VERTEBRATE ANAT	BOWLES	*
490	L	R,W,S	THEORETICAL BIO	STAFF	*

CHEMISTRY

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
100	L	R	INTRO CHEM	STAFF	
121		R	BEGIN CHEM	BOSCH,A	*
131		W	GEN CHEM	STAFF	
133		W	INTERM ORG CHEM & LAB	BOSCH,A	*
231		W,S	INTRO ORGANIC CHEM 2	BOSCH,A	*
320		W	BIOCHEMISTRY	BOSCH,A	*
331		W	PHYS CHEM 1	STAFF	
332		W	PHYS CHEM 2 & LAB	STAFF	
430		W,S	ADV ORGANIC CHEM	BOSCH,A	*
433		W	INORGANIC CHEM & LAB	STAFF	

COMMUNICATIONS & THEATRE

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
112	L	W,S	INTRO HUM COMM	ROBERTS	
130	L	R,W,S	UNDER MASS MEDIA	PEIRCE	*
150	L	S	ACTING I	LANGLEY	*
162		R	THEATRE CRAFTS	LANGLEY	*
212		W,S	THEORIES OF COMM	ROBERTS	
214		S	INTRAPERSONAL COMM	ROBERTS	
216	L	S	GROUP PROCESSES	BRUNSTING	
220		R,W,S	ORAL INTERP I	BRUNSTING	
232		R,W,S	BROADCASTING	PEIRCE	*
242	L	R,W	THEATRE HIST 3	MILLER	
262		R	STAGE CRAFT	LANGLEY	*
264		R	STAGE LIGHTING	LANGLEY	*
312	L	W,S	PUBLIC SPEAKING	BRUNSTING	
330		S	COMM IN ORGANIZ	BRUNSTING	
392		R,W,S	SEM: THEATRE MANAG	LANGLEY	*

CROSS CULTURAL

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
311	L	R,W,S	TOPICS: CRS CULT	HUFFMAN,M	*
311	L	W	TOPICS/CRS CULT	MILLER	

ECON & MANAGEMENT

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
341		W	INTERM ACCOUNTING	VRUWINK,C	

EDUCATION

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
210	L	W	INTRO TEACHING	COLLINS,D	
221		R, S	INTRO MENT RETAR	STAFF	
335		R,W	TEACHING SCI & SOC STUDIES	COLLINS,L	*
336		R,W,S	TCH READ CONT AR	HUIZER	*
337		R,W,S	TEACH LANG ARTS	HUIZER	*
434		R,W	TEACHING OF MATH	COLLINS,L	*
437		R,W,S	TEACH READING	HUIZER	*
438		R,W,S	READING DISABILITIES	HUIZER	*
439		R,W,S	TCH BILIN/BICULT	CHIARELLA	

ENGLISH

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
100		R,W,S	FUND COMPOSITION	HUFFMAN,M	*
100		W,S	FUND COMPOSITION	PEIRCE	*
100		W	FUND COMPOSITION	STEELE	*
100		W	FUND COMPOSITION	MILLER,CANNON,STAFF	
101		R,W,S	INTERM COMP	PEIRCE	*
103		R	DEVELOPMENT READ	BOSCH,D	
220	L	W	LIT: HBRW TO SHAKSPR	STAFF	
220	L	R,W	LIT: INTRO POETRY	MILLER	
228		W	LIT: CHILD & ADOL	STAFF	
236	L	W	AM LIT: 1620-1890	STAFF	
238	L	R,W	AM LIT: 1940-PRES	MILLER	
311		W	BR LIT: 800-1800	CANNON	
312		R,W	BR LIT: 1800-1920	MILLER	
330		R,W	INTRO LINGUISTIC	WEBBER	*
331		R	HIST OF LANGUAGE	WEBBER	*
332		R,W	ADV ENG GRAMMAR	HUFFMAN,M	*
356		W	LITERARY CRIT	CANNON	
385		R, S	TCH ENG 2nd LANGUAGE	HUFFMAN,M	*

GERMAN

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
121	L	S	BEGIN GERMAN	WEBBER	*
122	L	R	BEGIN GERMAN	WEBBER	*
123	L	R	BEGIN GERMAN	WEBBER	*
221	L	R,W,S	INTERM GERMAN	RITTER	
222	L	R,W,S	INTERM GERMAN	RITTER	
321	L	R,W,S	ADVANCED GERMAN	RITTER	
322	L	R,W,S	ADVANCED GERMAN	RITTER	
323	L	R,W,S	ADVANCED GERMAN	RITTER	
332	L	R,W,S	MSTRWKS GERMAN	WEBBER	*
333	L	R,W,S	MSTRWKS GERMAN	RITTER	

HISTORY

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
130	L	R	UNITED STATES	DE JONG,JOHN	
232	L	R	20th CENT AMER	DE JONG,JOHN	
250	L	W,S	LATIN AMER CIV	CAMP	
252	L	W	MOD OF LATIN AMER	CAMP	
320		R,W,S	JUNIOR SEMINAR	DE JONG,JOHN	

HOME ECONOMICS

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
131	L	R	FAMILY FOOD & NUTR	BAKER	*
132	L	R	FAMILY FOOD & NUTR	BAKER	*
140		W	COS DSGN & SELEC	BAKER	*
260	L	W,S	HOUSING/FAMILY	BAKER	*
270		R,W	CHILD DEVEL	RIPPENTROP	*
375	L	R, S	FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS	RIPPENTROP	*

HUMANITIES

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
101		R,W,S	AMER LANG & CIVIL	HUFFMAN,M	*

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
493		W,S	SEM LATIN AMER	CAMP	

MATH & COMPUTER SCIENCE

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
101		R	CLG ALG & TRG	STAFF	
250		W,S	DIFFEREN EQUATN	IVERSON	*

PHILOSOPHY & RELIGION

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
111	L	W	NEW TST & ERLY CHR	KOPECEK	
120	L	R,W	INTRO PHILOSOPHY	RAY	*
121	L	R,W,S	ETHICS	PAUL	*
122	L	R,W	SOCIAL PHIL	RAY	*
125		R,W,S	GENERAL LOGIC	RAY	*
215	L	S	JESUS & GOSPEL	KOPECEK	
216	L	S	PAUL & HIS INTERP	KOPECEK	
223	L	R,W	MODERN PHIL	PAUL	*
224	L	R,W	EXISTENTIALISM	RAY	*
225	L	W	CONTEMP PHIL	PAUL	*
252	L	W	THE REFORMATION	PAUL	*
355	L	W	CONTEMP CHR THOUGHT	PAUL	*

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
121	L	R,W	FUND ARCHERY	GOODWIN	
122	L	R,W	FUND BADMINTON	GOODWIN	
126		R,W,S	FUND RHYTHMS	GOODWIN	
129	L	R,W	FUND TENNIS	GOODWIN	
132		W,S	FUND WRESTLING	BOWZER	*
147		R,W,S	FUND TRACK	SCHIPPER	
150		W	HIST & MOD IMPLI PE	WALVOORD	*
151	L	R,W,S	HEALTH SAFETY	GOODWIN	
152		R,W	FIRST AID	GOODWIN	
210		R,W,S	TCH PE ELEM SCH	GOODWIN	
237		R,W,S	THEO & METH RECREA	GOODWIN	
345		R,W,S	TRACK THEORY	SCHIPPER	
347		W	BASKETBALL THEORY	WALVOORD	*
348		R,W,S	FOOTBALL THEORY	SCHIPPER	

PHYSICS

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
102		R,W	INTRO PHYSICS	STAFF	
113		R,W	LABORATORY-PHYSICS	STAFF	
113		W	LABORATORY-PHYSICS	BYERS	
115		R,W	TECHNOLOGY OF HOME	STAFF	
115		R,W	LABORATORY-PHYSICS	STAFF	
208	L	R,W	ENERGY & MAN	STAFF	
331		W	ADV LABORATORIES	BYERS	

POLITICAL SCIENCE

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
135	L	W,S	INTRO COMP POLIT	CAMP	
161	L	R, S	INTRO AM POL	RACHETER	*
210	L	R,W,S	POLITICAL PHIL	RACHETER	*
216	L	R, S	CITIZEN POLITICS	RACHETER	*
313		R, S	LEGIS POLITICS	RACHETER	*
314		R, S	JUDICIAL POLITIC	RACHETER	*
332	L	W,S	POL OF EMERG NAT	CAMP	
333	L	W,S	LATIN AMER POLI	CAMP	

SPANISH

CRS NO	LS	SKILL	TITLE	INSTRUCTOR	NEH
103	L	R,W,S	INTR: SPAN CULT	SMALLEY	
121	L	R,W	BEGIN SPANISH	SMALLEY	
221	L	R,W	INTERMED SPANISH	SMALLEY	
321	L	R,W,S	ADV SPANISH	STAFF	
331	L	R,W,S	SURVEY SPANISH LIT	STAFF	
431	L	R,W,S	SEM: SPANISH LIT	STAFF	